Musings.

BY ELDER JERROLD, OF PHILADELPHIA.

I presume you will say 'tis a fancy,
But it matters not to me;
There are voices and beings immortal,
That I think I hear and see.

I remember walking by moonlight,
At midnight when all alone,
And thought I heard in the pine trees,
A sad, yet musical tone.

It seemed like an angel sighing
In the branches of the tree;
And I listened and longed for the loved ones
That death had taken from me.

O! wherefore the sad, sad longing
For the loved ones gone before?
May they nevermore visit the lone ones
They left on this earthly shore?

Since God has placed this yearning
Within the poor stricken heart,
Is there no balm in Gilead
When our loved ones from us depart?

When waiting and watching at twilight,
May our departed not come,
Whispering midst leaves and roses
Tales of their beautiful home?

Oftimes when tossed on life's ocean,
It's billows my soul seem to chill;
A voice rises up within me,
And whispers "Peace be still."

I think 'tis said in the Bible—
"Ministering spirits are they."
Their sheltering wings are o'er us,
They protect us night and day.

I believe that the dear departed
Still visit this earthly wild,
That my loved, my angel mother,
Still watches o'er her child.

Are the ties so easily broken
That bound our hearts of yore?
Has she lost a mother's sympathy
Since she reached the heavenly shore?

I feel that she watches o'er me,
That she loves me more and more,
That she is not less a mother,
Because she has gone before.

There's a beautiful land far away;
Where the flowers ever bloom;
'Tis over Jordan so deep and cold—
The river of death and gloom.

There are angels playing on harps,
And loved ones pure and bright,
Who crossed the river long years ago
To the glorious land of light.

They seem to beckon our spirits away,
To that land where dwells the Bride;
To the mansion house not made with hands,
There evermore to reside.

For there's a house in that beautiful land,
Not built by human hands;
And a crystal river that gently flows
Over the golden sands.

Methinks I hear sweet musical sounds
Float down from the realm of light;
And carried away in spirit, I gaze
On that throne so great and white.

A halo of glory shines round my Lord,
Illuminating the land.
I listen to songs of rejoicing,
As angels around Him stand.

They join in singing hozannahs,
Casting their crowns at his feet,
And playing on golden harps,
As they walk the golden streets.

The gates of the city are made of pearl;
The walls are of jasper bright;
And Jesus' face like the noonday sun,
Forever doth drive away night.

The fields are arrayed in living green;
The fruits of that land are rare;
There's nothing within this vale of tears
That can with its joy compare.

Methinks I see the angels in white;
To the river with songs they come,
To welcome the old ship Zion from earth,
As she carries the ransomed home.

I see the blood-stained banner aloft
From the good old ship unfurled,
As she lands in the harbor of endless rest,
Weary souls from a wicked world.

I see them clasping each other's hands;
My loved ones from earth are there;
King Jesus wipes all their tears away,
They are free from sorrow and care.

Loved ones long parted are meeting,
A happy throng they come.
How I long to join in the chorus,
They sing me a welcome home.

You may call it idle dreaming,
You can call it what you may,
I'm sure that the loved ones from Heaven,
Still hover beside our way.

The "Power" of the "Covering."

BY EDWARD MASON.

Six or seven years ago, we were solemnly taught by the elders and ministers of the church that the sisters should wear a special covering on the head during time of prayer and worship. The church went so far as to specify the "covering" and give it a shape and a name. Thus the sisters were commanded to wear a cap as being the covering which was referred to by Paul in his exhortation in 1 Cor. 11. This law was compulsory, and the "covering" was considered among the ordiances of the church, and made essential to salvation. So prominent had this question become, that in the church literature it was honored with special reference and was even given a name—it was referred to as the "covering question." One of the prominent elders in the old church, made this subject the topic of a special discourse, which became very popular with those who were very strict in their adherence to these tenets of the church. And when any neighborhood was weak in the doctrine, this elder with his special subject was referred to, and he came and strengthened the church in this weak point. I remember hearing him once, after he was elected to the presidency of Ashland College, and on his first sermon he preached the "covering question." After he had exhausted all his arguments before a crowded house, he summed it all up in a few words, and the few words had more solid argument than all his discourse put together—he concluded by saying that he loved the cap because "his mother wore one and Annual meeting said so." There it was in a nut shell. That was the only argument in the whole matter, and I say it in all seriousness and with due respect.

When the division took place, and it was decided to break loose from all tradition, man made laws and superstition, we hoped that we had heard the last of the "covering question." But lo and behold, we have it resurrected, and every effort is made to make it "essential." Now come, brethren, let us examine the matter. As Progressive Brethren we dare not accept it as a doctrine of the church without investigation.

It is referred to but once, and that by Paul in a private letter to the church at Corinth.

Who has the authority to make the "doctrine" or ordinance of the church? We hear a thousand answers—Jesus and Jesus only.

Yet Jesus never mentioned this matter.

If this is only referred to once, and then to a particular church, does not that tell us that it is a local matter. Intended to suit that place, in such a way that a custom interfered with the proper fulfillment of the Christian law.

If, then, this was a local matter, it was not of general or universal application.

But let us see to the principle. In the first place, the subject referred to by Paul is quite different from that which is advocated by the church.

Paul refers to a veil which was to hide the face, as the hair of a woman hides her face when combed down. This is the practice and custom of the women of the east to this day.

A violation of this custom was a violation of the laws of respectability. Then it is no wonder that Paul laid stress on it.

So prominent and essential was it considered that Paul, as a Jew, advocated it so strongly that his arguments went back to the creation. Man was created first, then woman; woman for the man not man for the woman—man to be the glory and image of God, and woman to be the glory of the man. Both of them indeed are one in the Lord, but still in due subordination.

So lofty were the thoughts of the Apostle, that the question of the use or abandonment of women's veils leads him back to the creation of man. Yet with all that, it was only a local question, but by him applied as if for universal application.

In the midst of these high and dignified arguments, which seem to place the question beyond the pale of petty ritual to that of a religious ordinance he makes use of a phrase that has puzzled all the generations. On this disputed phrase hangs the whole question, so let us boldly wade in, and examine it in all its phases. He says the woman ought "to have power (*exousian*) upon her head because of the angels."

On this verse the strength and meaning of the whole passage seems to hinge. What does Paul here mean by "power?" Why must women have "power" on their heads *because of the angels*? These are very natural questions.

Many are the attempts that have been made to answer these questions. Men have been driven to alter the reading and tamper with it so as to give a plausible interpretation. One, for instance proposes *exousian* to be derived from *hexis* "habit". Another would read it in two words *ex ousias* and give it the totally impossible meaning of "in accordance with the nature." Still another will be found who tries to made it *exiousa*, "when she goes out." Then comes one who would read it *kausian*, a Macedonian hat. Such interpretations are only fit to be swept into oblivion.

Early commentators seemed to think there was no choice left for them but to make it mean "veil" or "covering." Even Jerome, a very learned author, seemed to think that this was a provincialism, and that it was used as a local and Tarsian expression meaning "veil." This cannot be disproved, but is only a conjecture. This has been done. For instance, Diodorus Siculus uses the Greek word *basilèia* "kingdom," to mean the crown, or token of a kingdom, in describing the statue of a queen as "having three kingdoms upon its head."

It is a curious fact that in Hebrew the word *radid*, which sometimes means a "veil" is derived from a verb, of which one of the meanings is "he subdued," and some think it is not impossible that the knowledge of this association between the two conceptions of "a veil" and "authority" may have smoothed the way for the Apostle's unusual phrase.

None of these ideas meet with much favor, and modern criticism settles down to the simple and plain meaning of the word—"power," in the sense of "a sign of power". But then the question naturally arises: "A sign of whose power—her own, or her husband's?"

Some say, "a sign of her own power," and make it apply not to the veil, but the natural covering, her own long hair. Still the context will not permit of this view. We see from 1 Cor. 12: 22, 23, that Paul considered a covering as a proof of inferiority in honor. It does seem that the simple good sense of the translators of authorized version hit upon the real meaning, which they have placed in the margin—that is, *a covering, in sign that she is under the power of her husband.* As a proof that this is the correct view, we need but point to the fact that the whole context is enforcing the superiority of the man.

The veil is regarded to this day, in the unchanging east, as a sign not of authority, but of subordination. In Persia only the married women wear it, and it is a mark by which it is known that they are under subjection. And this, too was the Roman custom. Probably this was what our Bro. Cassell refers to in his article, only he makes the mistake of making it the general custom of the east, when it was only in some parts.

Now let us keep this fact prominently before us, that it was a *sign of subjection—of woman's inferiority.*

Before closing this part of our investigation, let me call attention to one more fact. In Gen. 20: 16. Abimelech was indignant at Abraham because he had concealed the true relationship of Sarah to him, and said "Behold he is to thee a covering of eyes," this is generally understood to mean a veil, and is by the LXX, rendered *time*, which generally means "honor."

BECAUSE OF THE ANGELS.

What was the real reason in Paul's mind which led him to decide that a woman was, in public